

| | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/679,042 | SCHUSTER ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Tiffany A. Fetzner | 2859 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Amended

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner. (3) _____.

(2) Attorney Steven H. Noll Reg. no. 28,982. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 September 2005

Time: 9am

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

All the rejections that were potentially still pending, without the intended use concerns within claim 1, being resolved.

Claims discussed:

claims 1-16

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative, because the claims of June 27th 2005 were not fully supported by the actual claims as argued due to intended use issues resulting in not all features being given full patentable weight by the examiner. The attorney notes the examiner's concerns and agreed to the examiner making an examiner's amendment to claim 1 and any other claim, which required amendment, as a result of the amendments to claim 1, in order to maintain proper antecedent basis. The amendments made by the examiner are fully supported by applicant's originally disclosed figure 1 and are therefore free of new matter. The examiner was thanked for her time and assistance in moving the application forward toward allowance. The examiner notes that the amendments to claim 1 also eliminated any potential double patenting concerns with the applicant's other applications which were all filed on October 4th 2002. .